



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,581	08/26/2003	Takeshi Hagiwara	9319S-000224/DVB	5972

27572 7590 04/09/2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

NGO, HUYEN LE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,581

Applicant(s)

HAGIWARA, TAKESHI

Examiner

Julie-Huyen L. Ngo

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 11/881,655
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/2003.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1, 4-10 and 17-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 in view of Tajima (US006133978A).

Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 comprise all limitations recited in claims 1, 4-10 and 17-18 of the instant application except for an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate.

Tajima teaches (Fig. 4) forming an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by U.S. Patent No. US6665037 with a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

2. Claims 2 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 in view of Tajima (US006133978A).

Claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 comprises all limitations recited in claim 2 of the instant application except for an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate.

Tajima teaches (Fig. 4) forming an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by U.S. Patent No. US6665037 with a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 in view of Tajima (US006133978A).

Claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 comprises all limitations recited in claim 3 of instant application except an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate and an extended portion of said second substrate extending out of an edge of said first substrate.

Tajima teaches (Fig. 4) forming an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device, and extending a portion of said second substrate out of an edge of said first substrate for mounting ICs or TCPs on the periphery of a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by U.S. Patent No. US6665037 with a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device, and extending a portion of said second substrate out of an edge of said first substrate for mounting ICs or TCPs on the periphery of said second substrate.

4. Claims 4 and 11-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-18 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 in view of Tajima (US006133978A).

Claims 16-18 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 of instant application comprise all limitations recited in claims 4 and 11-12 except for an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate.

Tajima teaches (Fig. 4) forming an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by U.S. Patent No. US6665037 with a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

5. Claims 1 and 13-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 in view of Tajima (US6133978A).

Claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. US6665037 comprise all limitations recited in claims 1 and 13-16 of the instant application except for an electro-optic device

Art Unit: 2871

comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate and the limitations of claims 13-16.

Tajima teaches (Fig. 4) forming an electro-optic device comprising a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device.

It is conventional in the art for an electro-optic device to comprise a plurality of first electrodes and a plurality of second electrodes wherein

- number of first electrode is larger than that of said second electrode for dimensional choice of rectangular display.
- the first electrode made of transparent ITO film and the second electrode made of aluminum or silver alloy for reflecting light in a reflective display device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device disclosed by U.S. Patent No. US6665037 with:

- a plurality of driving ICs mounted on the second substrate for driving a large display device,
- the number of first electrode larger than that of said second electrode for dimensional choice of rectangular display.
- the first electrode made of transparent ITO film and the second electrode made of aluminum or silver alloy for reflecting light in a reflective display device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Kamio et al. (US5717475A) disclose a liquid crystal display device with the liquid crystal 3 disposed between the oppositely disposed transparent electrodes 6 constitutes a capacitive load in an electric circuit. However, the transparent electrodes 6 have a sheet resistance of 20-400 ohm.

Kim (US 6052169 A) discloses a liquid crystal display device having an equipotential electrode structure, in which the resistance of the leading parts of the electrodes is changed gradually so that the voltages on the leading parts can also be dropped gradually.

HAYAKAWA et al. (JP361059425A) disclose a liquid crystal display element with the resistance of column electrodes of the display element lower at the center part than at substrate end parts.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Julie-Huyen L. Ngo whose telephone number is (571) 272-2295. The Examiner can normally be reached on T-Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. Robert H. Kim can be reached at (571) 272-2293.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.

April 3, 2004



Julie Huyen L. Ngo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2871